

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

**BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.**



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

52  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/767,268	01/22/2001	Brennan J. Mcernan	4700-4	1994

29858 7590 08/13/2004

BROWN, RAYSMAN, MILLSTEIN, FELDER & STEINER LLP  
900 THIRD AVENUE  
NEW YORK, NY 10022

EXAMINER

WILLETT, STEPHAN F

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2141

DATE MAILED: 08/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/767,268

Applicant(s)

MCTERNAN ET AL.

Examiner

Stephan F Willett

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 December 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/13/02;5/28/01.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103<sup>®</sup> and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choquier et al. with Patent Number 5,951,694 in view of Battat et al. with patent Number 5,958,012.

4. Regarding claim(s) 1-2, Choquier teaches a computer network topology determination system. Choquier teaches a producer/user to specify connections, col. 10, lines 47-61. Choquier teaches flow of data between elements, col. 10, lines 38-46. Choquier teaches element locations and identification, col. 11, lines 44-57. Choquier teaches the invention in the above claim(s) except for explicitly teaching presentation data structures. In that Choquier operates to generate topology outlines, the artisan would have looked to the computer network representation arts for

Art Unit: 2141

details of implementing topology presentations. In that art, Battat, a related network manager, teaches a "comprehensive database describing every computer-related asset on a network", col. 7, lines 63-64 in order to provide a view to the makeup of the network. Battat specifically teaches "this module performs the actual graphics rendering of all visible objects", col. 9, lines 39-41 and at col. 8, lines 21-25. Further, Battat suggests that "a view may also display internal hardware, firmware, and software of any network component", abstract, lines 14-16 in implementing his network management system. The motivation to incorporate clear graphical displays insures that a user friendly environment is maintained. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the display as taught in Battat into the topology system described in Choquier because Choquier operates with topology data and Battat suggests that optimization can be obtained when displaying topology data. Therefore, by the above rationale, the above claims are rejected.

5. Regarding claims 3, Battat teaches lists of objects or resources, col. 9, lines 21-24. Thus, the above claim limitations are obvious in view of the combination.

6. Regarding claims 4, Battat teaches replacing elements or objects, col. 9, lines 24-31. Thus, the above claim limitations are obvious in view of the combination.

7. Regarding claim 5, the Choquier and Battat patents disclose the method of the preceding claims. The Choquier and Battat patents do not explicitly disclose tapping a signal and encoding said signal. However, Official Notice is taken MPEP 2144.03 (a)) that tapping a signal to encode the signal is well known in the art to insure the desired coding process is obtained. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the application's invention to tap and encode a signal to obtain the advantages of communicating with the desired

Art Unit: 2141

signal encoding. By the above rationale, the claim is rejected.

8. Regarding claims 6-7, Choquier teaches processing power and bandwidth, col. 11, 5, lines 26-40, 65-67, respectively. Thus, the above claim limitations are obvious in view of the combination.

9. Regarding claim 8-9, the Choquier and Battat patents disclose the method of the preceding claims. The Choquier and Battat patents do not explicitly disclose tapping a signal and encoding said signal. However, Official Notice is taken MPEP 2144.03 (a)) that tapping a signal to encode the signal is well known in the art to insure the desired coding process is obtained. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the application's invention to tap and encode a signal to obtain the advantages of communicating with the desired signal encoding. By the above rationale, the claim is rejected.

10. Regarding claims 10, Choquier teaches processing power and bandwidth, col. 11, 5, lines 26-27, 65-67, respectively. Thus, the above claim limitations are obvious in view of the combination.

II. Claims 11-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choquier et al. with Patent Number 5,951,694 in view of Battat et al. with patent Number 5,958,012 and Tanaka et al. with patent Number 6,020,927.

12. Regarding claim(s) 11, 15-16, Choquier teaches a computer network topology determination system. Choquier teaches a producer/user to specify connections, col. 10, lines 47-61. Choquier teaches flow of data between elements, col. 10, lines 38-46. Choquier teaches element locations and identification, col. 11, lines 44-57. Choquier teaches processing power and bandwidth, col. 11, 5, lines 26-40, 65-67, respectively. Choquier teaches the invention in the

Art Unit: 2141

above claim(s) except for explicitly teaching presentation data structures. Choquier and Battat teaches the invention in the above claim(s) except for explicitly teaching encoding a tapped signal. In that Choquier operates to generate topology outlines, the artisan would have looked to the computer network representation arts for details of implementing topology presentations. In that art, Battat, a related network manager, teaches a "comprehensive database describing every computer-related asset on a network", col. 7, lines 63-64 in order to provide a view to the makeup of the network. Battat specifically teaches "this module performs the actual graphics rendering of all visible objects", col. 9, lines 39-41 and at col. 8, lines 21-25. Tanaka specifically teaches "converts ... then taps off a first digital video signal", col. 3, lines 62-63. Further, Battat suggests that "a view may also display internal hardware, firmware, and software of any network component", abstract, lines 14-16 in implementing his network management system. The motivation to incorporate clear graphical displays insures that a user friendly environment is maintained. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the display as taught in Battat into the topology system described in Choquier because Choquier operates with topology data and Battat suggests that optimization can be obtained when displaying topology data. Therefore, by the above rationale, the above claims are rejected.


13. Regarding claims 12, Choquier teaches processing power and bandwidth, col. 11, 5, lines 26-40, 65-67, respectively. Thus, the above claim limitations are obvious in view of the combination.

14. Regarding claims 13-14, Battat teaches agents to decide bandwidth or objects, etc., col. 8, lines 3-7. Thus, the above claim limitations are obvious in view of the combination.

Art Unit: 2141

**Conclusion**

1. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure is disclosed in the Notice of References Cited. A close review of the references is suggested. A close review of the Bowman-Amuah reference with Patent Number 6,742,015 is suggested. The other references cited teach numerous other ways to perform object/resource selection in processing, thus a close review of them is suggested.
2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephan Willett whose telephone number is (703) 308-5230. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 8:00 AM to 6:00 PM.
3. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia, can be reached on (703) 305-4003. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.
4. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9605.



Stephan Willett

Patent Examiner

August 4, 2004